



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/321,743	05/28/1999	LEE C. HAROLD	53470.000012	6991

29315 7590 09/11/2003

MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY AND POPEO PC
12010 SUNSET HILLS ROAD
SUITE 900
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER

SINGH, RACHNA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 09/11/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/321,743

Applicant(s)

HAROLD ET AL.

Examiner

Rachna Singh

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 November 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 11/26/02 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 12.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to Amendment A filed 11/26/02. Petition to revive was granted on 2/20/03.
2. Claims 1-24 are pending. Claims 1, 10, 18, and 24 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-13, 15-20, and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yost et al., US Patent 6,567,796 B1, 5/20/03 (filed 7/1/99, provisional filed 3/23/99).

In reference to claims 1, 10, and 18, Yost teaches a system and method for an automatic OLAP report broadcast system. Yost discloses the use of templates that define a report format and specify attributes, dimensions, and display properties that define the report. His system comprises the following:

-Transmission of OLAP report output to a user output device. The user may select a project which is a collection or reports (compare to workbook) to be selected for processing in the OLAP system. See column 8, lines 34-57. Compare to ***"report requesting means . . . for processing by an OLAP system"***.

-Templates for defining report format. See column 6, lines 31-62. A format module for formatting the results into a format corresponding to the subscriber (user).

Art Unit: 2176

Personalization module used to enable users to input personalized choices and define filters for the project. A user can tailor display format of a report using the personalization module. A project may comprise multiple reports. See column 8.

Compare to ***“format specification means for enabling the user to select a format for each report in the workbook.”***

While Yost does not use the term “workbook” he does indicate that “project” includes a plurality of reports which is analogous to a workbook. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a format specification means for a workbook since it existed for a project which also consists of a plurality of reports.

In reference to claims 2, 11, and 19, Yost teaches that a user may define filters/formats on a global level or report level. See column 8, lines 34-49.

In reference to claims 3, 12, and 20, Yost teaches that some personalization filters/formats may be assigned for all of the reports or for a particular report. Furthermore, Yost teaches the hierarchical nature of some OLAP systems in which a user can perform multidimensional analysis on data. There are more detailed levels of data in a hierarchical set-up. See columns 3-4. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Yost’s multidimensional hierarchy into his formatting feature to have lower level formats supersede higher level formats since he already takes into account the nature of the hierarchy.

In reference to claims 4 and 13, Yost teaches that the levels of format range from global formats to report formats to attribute/element format and value formats. See column 6, lines 31-62 and column 8.

In reference to claims 6, 15, and 22, Yost teaches that the format of one of the reports may comprise a grid or graph. See columns 6-8.

In reference to claims 7 and 16, Yost teaches that a user can apply filters to apply to the report. See column 8.

In reference to claims 8, 17, and 23, Yost teaches a personalization of the report output in which a user can specify the format in which the report is presented. See column 6 and column 8.

5. Claims 5, 9, 14, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yost et al., US Patent 6,567,796 B1, 5/20/03 (filed 7/1/99, provisional filed 3/23/99) in view of Siow et al., US Patent 6,301,590, 10/9/2001 (filed 8/11/97).

In reference to claims 5, 14, and 21, Yost does not disclose a format of a merged report; however, Siow discloses a system in which the user can specify multiple reports and format for the display of the multiple reports on a single page. See column 9, lines 32-61. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Siow's system of merging reports into Yost's system since it allows a user to present information from multiple reports within a workbook in a single presentation. Both Siow and Yost are concerned with reports within a workbook (or project).

In reference to claim 9, Yost's system does not teach a scripted format created by the user; however, Siow discloses a system for formatting and displaying reports from data on the Internet. The data is obtained for a report by accessing a data repository. Siow discloses using script language to format the report. See column 2. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Siow's method of formatting a report obtained from data in a repository into Yost's system for requesting and formatting reports in a workbook since using script language for formatting was well known in the art. Moreover, both Siow and Yost are concerned with reports within a workbook (or project).

6. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yost et al., US Patent 6,567,796 B1, 5/20/03 (filed 7/1/99, provisional filed 3/23/99) in view of Cook et al., US Patent 6,201,948 B1, 3/13/01 (filed 3/16/98).

In reference to claim 24, Yost teaches a system and method for an automatic OLAP report broadcast system. Yost discloses the use of templates that define a report format and specify attributes, dimensions, and display properties that define the report. His system comprises the following:

- Transmission of OLAP report output to a user output device. The user may select a project which is a collection of reports (compare to workbook) to be selected for processing in the OLAP system. See column 8, lines 34-57. Compare to ***"report requesting means . . . for processing by an OLAP system"***.
- Templates for defining report format. See column 6, lines 31-62. A format module for formatting the results into a format corresponding to the subscriber (user).

Personalization module used to enable users to input personalized choices and define filters for the project. A user can tailor display format of a report using the personalization module. A project may comprise multiple reports. See column 8. Compare to ***“format specification means for enabling the user to select a format for each report in the workbook.”***

While Yost does not use the term “workbook” he does indicate that “project” includes a plurality of reports which is analogous to a workbook. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a format specification means for a workbook since it existed for a project which also consists of a plurality of reports.

Yost does not teach asynchronous processing; however, Cook does. Cook teaches that that a response can be generated asynchronously to a student using software. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to process report generation asynchronously since it was well known in the art at the time of the invention to present information asynchronously as taught by Cook. See column 12.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2176

Anand et al.	US Patent 5,692,181	11/25/97
Lore et al.	US Patent 6,163,774	12/19/00 (filed 5/24/99)
Clancey	US Patent 6,134,563	10/00
Ainsbury	US Patent 6,078,924	06/00

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rachna Singh at 703.305.1952. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild, can be reached at 703.305.9792.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is 703.305.3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:


Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

After-Final	703.746.7238
Official	703.746.7239
Non-Official/Draft	703.746.7240

Hand-Delivered responses should be brought to Crystal park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Rachna Singh
September 2, 2003


SANJIV SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER